

The request for an extension of time is made in good faith and not for purposes of delay.

Dated this 22nd day of August, 2016.

POINTS AND AUTHORITIES

I. INTRODUCTION

This case was filed on January 13, 2016. Plaintiff's Second¹ Amended Complaint was filed on May 24, 2016, after the Court granted Plaintiff leave to amend on May 2, 2016. (EFC No. 55). Defendant Philippe Rousa was added as a party at that time. All Defendants except for Defendant Philippe Rousa have been served with process.

II. ARGUMENT

A. Good cause exists to grant Plaintiff's Motion to Extend Time for Service on Defendant Philippe Rousa.

Federal Rules of Civil Procedure (FRCP) Rule 6(b) provides in relevant part:

(1) In General: When an act may or must be done within a specified time, the court may, for good cause, extend time: (A) with to without motion or notice if the court acts, or is a request is made.

Fed. R. Civ. P. 6.

Furthermore, the Rule which governs the time limit for service in Federal Court says "[if] a defendant is not served within 90 days after the complaint is filed, the court—on motion or on its own after notice to the plaintiff—must dismiss the action without prejudice against that defendant or order that service be made within a specified time. But if the plaintiff shows good cause for the failure, the court

¹ The Second Amended Complaint was incorrectly designated as the First Amended Complaint.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

must extend the time for service for an appropriate period. Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(m). This Rule "require[s] a court to extend time if good cause is shown and ... allow[s] a court discretion to dismiss or extend time absent a showing of good cause." Matasareanu v. Williams, 183 F.R.D. 242, 245 (C.D. Cal. 1998), citing Petrucelli v. Bohringer and Ratzinger, GMBH Ausdereitungsanlagen, 46 F.3d 1298, 1305 (3d Cir.1995).

Here, good cause exists to allow Plaintiff additional time for service because Plaintiff has diligently attempted to locate Defendant Philippe Rousa, but has not been able to affect service as of this date. Defendant Saljougui and Aria Defendants have been less than forthcoming with contact information for Defendant Philippe Rousa including Defendant Saljougui claiming to not know his last name and, although having telephone contact with him, could not identify his phone number.

According to Defendant Saljougui's testimony, it was Defendant Philippe Rousa who originally made contact with Defendant Aria and its security personnel to report Plaintiff's alleged extortion of Defendant Saljougui and included Defendant Philippe Rousa providing a telephone recording made by Defendant Saljougui to Defendant Aria and speaking on her behalf. (Ex. 1, Declaration of Victoria L. Neal, \P 5).

Defendant Aria only identifies Defendant Philippe Rousa in a security report as "a guest." (ECF No. 44-1). Id. at ¶ 6. During her deposition, Defendant Saljougui described Defendant Philippe Rousa as a "resident" at the Aria. Id. According to a recording made by Defendants Hedrick and Hoon Lee when interviewing Defendant Saljougui, Defendant Philippe Rousa is well known to Aria upper management including Defendant Hedrick working with Defendant Philippe Rousa on other issues and Defendant Hedrick's bosses having numerous dealings with Defendant Philippe Rousa². Id. In addition, it was Defendant Philippe Rousa who called to make sure Aria security met with Defendant Saljougui, as well as Defendant Hedrick meeting with Defendant Philippe Rousa after the interview. Id. Furthermore,

² This recording was disclosed by Defendant Aria and marked for identification purposes as Aria 154 and 155. In addition, this recording was disclosed by Plaintiff as part of his DETR filed obtained via subpoena.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

Defendant Aria has also been less than forthcoming with information about their resident guest, Defendant Philippe Rousa even though he is obviously a witness critical to their defense in this matter. Id. at ¶ 7. To date Defendant Aria has not disclosed Defendant Philippe Rousa in their initial disclosures in this matter. In Plaintiff's meet and confer letter to Defendant Aria dated May 24, 2016, Plaintiff asked Defendant Aria to disclose Defendant Philippe Rousa's contact information. Id. On May 31, 2016, counsel met and conferred on Defendant Aria's deficient discovery responses. Id. At that time, it was requested that Defendant Aria amend its initial disclosures to include, among other information, Defendant Philippe Rousa's contact information. Id. On July 27, 2016, again contacted Defendant Aria for Defendant Philippe Rousa's contact information. Id. On July 28, 2016, Defendant Aria provided an address that after further research confirms the address to be that of a UPS store. Defendant Aria did not provide any telephone number for Defendant Philippe Rousa. Id. Plaintiff's research and efforts to locate Defendant Philippe Rousa have likewise led to dead ends and include: (1) searches conducted through the Clark County Assessor to locate property holdings; (2) searches conducted through the Nevada Secretary of State for business associations; (3) searches conduct through Clark County Licensing for business license holdings; (4) searches conducted through various internet sites for locating information about people; (5) searches of local media information; (6) searches of internet articles; and (7) searches of social media. Id at ¶ 4.

Defendants obviously have additional contact information for Defendant Philippe Rousa which they have refused to disclose. Plaintiff needs additional time to locate Defendant Philippe Rousa which includes time to employee the services of a skip-tracer and private investigator, as well as obtaining additional information about Defendant Philippe Rousa in upcoming depositions.

1 III. CONCLUSION. 2 Plaintiff respectfully request this Court to issue an Order permitting Plaintiff an additional 60-3 day period to perfect service of Defendant Philippe Rousa. 4 DATED this 22nd August, 2016. 5 /s/ Victoria L.. Neal 6 JAMES P. KEMP, ESQUIRE Nevada Bar No.: 006375 7 VICTORIA L. NEAL, ESQUIRE Nevada Bar No.: 13382 8 KEMP & KEMP, ATTORNEYS AT LAW 7435 W. Azure Drive, Suite 110, 9 Las Vegas, NV 89130 10 Attorneys for Plaintiff William Soto 11 12 **ORDER** 13 ATTORNEYS AT LAW 7435 W. Azure Drive, Suite 110 IT IS SO ORDERED: 14 15 Dated this 23 day of August, 2016. 16 17 UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE LEEN Tel. 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE The undersigned hereby certifies that on the date indicated below, a copy of the foregoing motion was served on the following as indicated: All Parties Registered Through the CM/ECF system. Dated this 22nd day of August, 2016. /s/ Victoria L. Neal An employee of KEMP & KEMP, Attorneys at Law

ATTORNEYS AT LAW 7435 W. Azure Drive, Suite 110

EXHIBIT INDEX

1. DECLARATION OF VICTORIA L. NEAL

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

DISTRICT OF NEVADA ***

WILLIAM SOTO, 10

Case No.: 2:16-CV-00064-JAD-PAL

Plaintiff, VS.

DECLARATION VICTORIA L. NEAL

ARIA RESORT & CASINO, LLC, a Domestic) Limited Liability Company: MELANIE SALJOUGUI, an individual; YONG HOON LEE, an individual; JERALD HEDRICK, an individual; ROBERT FISHBOURNE; an individual; TODD OWEN, an individual; and,) PHILIPPE ROUAS, an individual,

Defendants.

18 19

20

21

7

8

9

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

Tel.

ATTORNEYS AT LAW
7435 W. Azure Drive, Suite 110
LAS VEGAS, NEVADA 89130
B. (702) 258-1183 + Fax (702) 258-6983

COMES NOW VICTORIA L. NEAL, ESQ., and hereby declares under penalty of perjury as

22

follows:

1. I am a resident of Clark County, Nevada, and over the age of eighteen (18) years of age.

24

23

2. I am an attorney duly licensed to practice before all courts within the State of Nevada,

25 26

including the United States District Court for the District of Nevada. I am counsel of record for

27

28

Plaintiff, William Soto.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

I make this declaration of my own personal knowledge and each assertion contained herein is true and correct to the best of my knowledge, except those assertions made upon information and belief, and as to those assertions, I believe them to be true. If called to testify to the matters contained in this declaration, I would competently testify to the same.

- 4. Plaintiff's counsel has diligently tried to locate Defendant Philippe Rousa including: (1) searches conducted through the Clark County Assessor to locate property holdings; (2) searches conducted through the Nevada Secretary of State for business associations; (3) searches conduct through Clark County Licensing for business license holdings; (4) searches conducted through various internet sites for locating information about people; (5) searches of local media information; (6) searches of internet articles; and (7) searches of social media.
- 5. According to Defendant Saljougui's testimony, it was Defendant Philippe Rousa who originally made contact with Defendant Aria and its security personnel to report Plaintiff's alleged extortion of Defendant Saljougui and included Defendant Philippe Rousa providing a telephone recording made by Defendant Saljougui to Defendant Aria and speaking on her behalf.
- 6. Defendant Aria only identifies Defendant Philippe Rousa in a security report as "a guest." (ECF No. 44-1). During her deposition, Defendant Saljougui described Defendant Philippe Rousa as a "resident" at the Aria. According to a recording made by Defendant Hedrick and Hoon Lee when interviewing Defendant Saljougui, Defendant Philippe Rousa is well known to Aria upper management including Defendant Hedrick working with Defendant Philippe Rousa on other issues and Defendant Hedrick's bosses having numerous dealings with Defendant Philippe Rousa¹. In addition, it was Defendant Philippe Rousa who called to make sure Aria security met with Defendant Saljougui, as well as Defendant Hedrick meeting with Defendant Philippe Rousa after the interview. Furthermore, Defendant Hedrick said his boss would be reaching out to Defendant Philippe Rousa about the incident.

¹ This recording was disclosed by Defendant Aria and marked for identification purposes as Aria 154 and 155. In

7435 W. Azure Drive, Suite 110 LAS VEGAS, NEVADA 89130 (702) 258-1183 • Fax (702) 258-6983 Tel.

7. Defendant Aria has also been less than forthcoming with information about their resident
guest, Defendant Philippe Rousa even though he is obviously a witness critical to their defense in this
matter. To date Defendant Aria has not disclosed Defendant Philippe Rousa in their initial disclosures in
this matter. In Plaintiff's meet and confer letter to Defendant Aria dated May 24, 2016, Plaintiff asked
Defendant Aria to disclose Defendant Philippe Rousa's contact information On May 31, 2016, counsel
met and conferred on Defendant Aria's deficient discovery responses. At that time, it was requested that
Defendant Aria amend its initial disclosures to include, among other information, Defendant Philippe
Rousa's contact information. On July 27, 2016, again contacted Defendant Aria for Defendant Philippe
Rousa's contact information. On July 28, 2016, Defendant Aria provided an address that after further
research confirms the address to be that of a UPS store. Defendant Aria did not provide any telephone
number for Defendant Philippe Rousa. Plaintiff's research and efforts to locate Defendant Philippe Rousa
has likewise led to dead ends including research of property records, Clark County business licenses and
the Nevada State Secretary of State records. Plaintiff may be forced to file a motion to compel to obtain
information necessary to serve Defendant Philippe Rousa.

8. Defendant Philippe Rousa is believed to be a French national who has extensive business ties in Las Vegas and with business man Norbert Aleman previous owner of Crazy Girls Burlesque Show. In addition, upon information and belief, Defendant Philippe Rousa is a semi-professional poker player playing in local tournament and at one time hosted his own poker tournament in Las Vegas.

FURTHER, THE DECLARANT SAYETH NAUGHT.

DATED this 22nd day of August, 2016.

Victoria L. Neal, Esq. Nevada Bar No.: 13382

KEMP & KEMP

7435 W. Azure Drive, Suite 110 Las Vegas, Nevada 89130

addition, this recording was disclosed by Plaintiff as part of his DETR filed obtained via subpoena.